DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 756 CE 027 004

AUTHOR Greenan, James P., Ed.
TITLE Interagency Cooperation and Agreements. Policy Paper Series: Document 4.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 80
GRANT G007900952
NOTE 80p.: For related documents see CE 026 980-982 and CE 027 002-003.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education: *Agency Cooperation: Cooperative Planning: *Coordination: *Disabilities: Educational Legislation: Elementary Secondary Education: Federal Legislation: Postsecondary Education: Private Agencies: Public Agencies: Special Education: Staff Development: *Statewide Planning: *Teacher Education: *Vocational Education: Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS Linkage

ABSTRACT

This product of a Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education contains a series of policy papers intended to identify and address several issues that relate to developing effective cooperation and agreement among agencies. Four papers address these topics and issues: (1) State Planning for Interagency Cooperation, (2) Training Educational Personnel to Implement Effective Interagency Cooperation and Agreements for Serving Handicapped Learners, (3) Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel for Working with Students Who Have Special Needs, and (4) Effective Linkages for Interagency Cooperation. Each paper suggests major issues for further consideration and/or recommendations. An epilogue summarizes the papers' contents. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED194756

Interagency Cooperation and Agreements

Policy Paper Series: Document 4

Edited by

James P. Greenan
Research and Development Coordinator
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

A Publication of the
**LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE/
VOCATIONAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION**

College of Education
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

Sponsored by

Division of Personnel Preparation
Office of Special Education
U.S. Education Department

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Janet Treichel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

May 1980

CE 027 004

The contents of this publication were developed under grant number G007900952 from the Division of Personnel Preparation, Office of Special Education, U.S. Education Department. However, these contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the agency, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

FOREWORD

The mid and late 1970's were characterized by the enactment of new, major legislative mandates in the education and employment of handicapped individuals. Public Law 94-142 and Sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 have had profound effects upon educators and employers. In response to these mandates, a number of diverse programming approaches and policies have been implemented by vocational and special educators, and vocational rehabilitation personnel at the state and local levels.

The Leadership Training Institute (LTI)/Vocational and Special Education was established to assist state leadership personnel in improving and expanding vocational education opportunities for handicapped learners. The project is supported by a grant from the Division of Personnel Preparation, Office of Special Education, U.S. Education Department. Through the project, emerging legislative issues and priorities pertaining to vocational education for handicapped learners are addressed in regional leadership training institutes. By March, 1981, eight institutes will have been conducted throughout the nation addressing a variety of key issues.

This series of policy papers on Interagency Cooperation and Agreements is a product of the fourth Leadership Training Institute which was held in Orlando, Florida, on March 2-4, 1980. A comprehensive literature review and a small scale needs assessment survey identified a number of major concerns in this area such as state planning, training educational personnel for interagency cooperation, vocational

and special education personnel preparation, and effective linkages for interagency cooperation.

Several recognized leaders in the area of interagency cooperation and agreements were invited to prepare papers addressing each of the major concerns that had been identified. It is a pleasure to share these insightful and cogent policy papers through the production of this volume. The LTI is greatly indebted to the authors for their excellent contributions: Robert J. LaCasse, New York State Education Department; Dr. Don E. McNelly, University of Tennessee; Dr. Ray Sankovsky, Auburn University; and Dr. Lloyd W. Tindall, Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Dr. James P. Greenan, Research and Development Coordinator for the LTI, has done an outstanding job in planning and editing this policy paper series. His tireless efforts were much appreciated. Dr. Janet Treichel, Training and Dissemination Coordinator, was instrumental in the production and dissemination of each of the policy paper series. A special note of appreciation is extended to Ms. Judy McClughen and Ms. Margaret Hensel for their assistance in typing and proofing the manuscript.

L. Allen Phelps, Director
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education

PREFACE

Interagency cooperation is generally perceived as the coordination of the available resources of both public and private agencies whose objective is to provide vocational education instruction and services to handicapped learners. The services may be special, vocational, or rehabilitative in nature. The efficient and effective delivery of vocational assessment, vocational instruction, support services, and other essential related services is dependent upon coordination among the various service providers.

Recent federal legislation and initiatives have strongly suggested that agencies which receive federal funding begin to plan and implement meaningful interagency agreements. This infers that agencies such as Vocational Education, Special Education, and Vocational Rehabilitation need to coordinate their resources in a way that will effectively serve handicapped learners in vocational education. It also implies that the agencies efficiently use the federal funds they receive by avoiding duplication of services. However, several existing barriers inhibit the development of practical interagency cooperation and agreements.

The Interagency Cooperation and Agreements Policy Paper Series is intended to identify and address several of the issues that relate to developing effective cooperation and agreements among agencies. The topics and issues that are addressed include:

- State Planning for Interagency Cooperation.
- Training Educational Personnel to Implement Effective Interagency Cooperation and Agreements for Serving Handicapped Learners.

- Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel for Working With Students Who Have Special Needs.
- Effective Linkages for Interagency Cooperation.

These titles do not reflect an all inclusive list of topics relating to post-secondary vocational education for handicapped learners. However, they do provide a basis for examining some of the significant issues and concerns that presently exist.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

State Planning for Interagency Cooperation
Robert J. LaCasse 1

Training Educational Personnel to Implement Effective Interagency Cooperation and Agreements for Serving Handicapped Learners
Don E. McNelly 13

Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel for Working With Students Who Have Special Needs
Ray Sankovsky 33

Effective Linkages for Interagency Cooperation
Lloyd W. Tindall 53

Epilogue
James P. Greenan 73

State Planning for Interagency Cooperation

by

Robert J. LaCasse
Supervisor-Occupational Education Instruction
for the Handicapped
New York State Education Department
Office of Occupational and Continuing Education
Albany, New York

INTRODUCTION

The concept of interagency cooperation is not a new phenomenon of the 1980's. As early as 1963, federal legislation in vocational education (P.L. 88-210) provided for entering into cooperative arrangements with other agencies and organizations. In 1968, the Indiana Department of Public Instruction, Divisions of Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Vocational Education, published a draft model of an agreement which could be drawn up between a school system and the three divisions of the Department (Young, 1969).

As early as 1964, a vocational education project was funded in the Manatee County School District in Florida to develop "a comprehensive and coordinated program between special education and rehabilitation with the objective of bridging the gap between education and remunerative employment" (Young, 1969). Other school districts and cities which had coordinated programs in operation during the mid 1960's were Buffalo, New York; Detroit, Michigan; and Cleveland, Ohio. The futurists of the 1960's also saw cooperative planning become a viable element in American society. Kahn and Weiner (1967) in projecting the last third of the twentieth century, indicated that interagency coopera-

tion would become a necessary component in the planning process, if progress was to be made in the most cost-effective manner.

RECENT FEDERAL INITIATIVES

The evidence seems to indicate that cooperative planning is a recognized necessity and the process is well established. A study by Krantz and Weatherman (1975) contradicted this assumption. They examined the state of the art in relation to the mandates of the vocational education legislation and found that after 12 years the efforts at the state level were still disjointed and relatively ineffective. During the 1970's, Congress continued to call for cooperative efforts as evidenced in such legislation as P.L. 93-112, The Rehabilitation Act of 1973; P.L. 94-142, The Education of all Handicapped Children Act of 1975; and P.L. 94-482, The Education Amendments of 1976.

It was not until 1978 that the federal agencies responsible for implementing these laws, became serious about the mandates. In April of that year, the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education and Bureau of Education for the Handicapped recommended to the Commissioner of Education the issuance of a "Position Statement on Comprehensive Vocational Education for all Handicapped Persons." In the transmittal memo, the Deputy Commissioners indicated that:

> "The position statement will serve as the basis for the development of a joint administrative plan to coordinate activities of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped and the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education in such areas as personnel training, program development and demonstration, dissemination of information, leadership training, and technical assistance as they relate to appropriate comprehensive vocational education of the handicapped."

On September 25, 1978, the Federal Register published the policy paper which provided official sanction to the ensuing activities. Later in the fall of 1978, a joint memorandum was issued by the Commissioners of Education and Rehabilitation Services expanding the intent of the original policy statement to include vocational rehabilitation and to identify specific categories for consideration in developing cooperative agreements. A list of activities that can generally be provided by special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation was attached to the memo. It identified those activities that were excluded under most circumstances, or lack authorization in the statutory authority for that program.

This memo further called for the initiation of a national training workshop for special educators, vocational educators, and rehabilitation administrators on February 1-2, 1979. Over 200 plus agency personnel from across the country met in Washington, D.C. to receive the mandate from the Commissioner of Education and the Commissioner of Rehabilitation Services. The remainder of the program was devoted to identifying agency roles in comprehensive and collaborative programming for the handicapped and reviewing the "process model" which could guide state efforts and facilitate initiatives for interagency cooperation. The conference handbook provided the background, legislative references, process model, and examples of agreements recently developed by the states of Idaho and Michigan. Prepared with the mandates and some "tools" to use, the participants were encouraged to return to their agencies and begin planning for interagency cooperation.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Before attempting to engage in interagency cooperation efforts, a reference base should be established for the terminology being used. The Funk and Wagnall's dictionary provides the following definitions:

Cooperate - to work together toward a common goal.

Plan - a detailed scheme or method for the accomplishment of an activity.

Collaborate - to work together, especially in a joint intellectual effort.

Linkage - the act or process of linking; the state or condition of being linked.

Agreement - act or state of agreeing; an agreement between parties.

In examining the words most commonly used today, it must be recognized that interagency cooperation is a multi-faceted topic. The main components seem to be agreement and plan. The first implies agreeing to agree, a phenomenon in bureaucracy and new to agencies responsible for serving similar populations. The plan identifies the detailed method. Whether cooperate, collaborate, or link is used seems to be incidental because they all imply working together. In summary, interagency cooperation is an activity by which agencies join forces with one another for similar populations. The major objective is to provide the best possible services along a continuum in the most cost-effective way.

Ottmar (1979) provided some interesting thoughts relative to interagency agreements. He stated:

> "essentially, written agreements record what two parties have agreed to do in respect to a certain issue. This definition implies that a great deal of work has been done to develop the content that is summarized and recorded in the agreement. If there is no compelling reason to write an agreement, it probably should not be written. However, the benefit of a written agreement is that you and the cooperating party are forced to think through your roles, vis a vis one another and to commit yourselves on paper. Written agreements may be more restrictive than the informal arrangements on which you might have relied otherwise. Nevertheless, written agreements have a real purpose. They force a definition recording, and communication of the legitimate expectations which two agencies may have of one another in meeting a need."

The end product of written agreements should be cooperative arrangements for clients. However, one concern is that the present thrust for interagency cooperation could lead to developing agreements because it is expected, not because it could benefit the clientele to be served. Another concern is that the document will end up on a shelf, collecting dust. We must ask ourselves, "Will it happen to ours?"

New York State raised this question and is including the following components in their procedure to develop effective interagency cooperation and agreements.

1. Memo of Agreement - state the philosophy of interagency cooperation and identify the broad based areas which will be addressed cooperatively.

2. Translate the Memo of Agreement into specific annual goals in the state plan developed by each office.

3. The state plan is the working document of each office, therefore the divisions and bureaus can develop specific activities which will be implemented to carry out the goals.

It is believed that this process, which will take about two years to implement, will result in positive program improvements and therefore

will not be a document collecting dust on a shelf. It is recognized that local written agreements will have to be specific and address such items as defining services, eligibility, provision of services, and others.

ESSENTIAL PLANNING ELEMENTS FOR EFFECTIVE INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

What is needed at the state level to implement and maintain the thrust for interagency cooperation? Experience seems to indicate that commitment and leadership at the highest level is of utmost importance. It must be more than passive involvement. There needs to be visible recognition of the benefits to clients and the system; not just meeting some compliance item in the legislation.

The commitment needs to be at the highest decision making level if it is to result in decision making and movement in any direction. The decision makers should be able to identify specific individuals within their structure who can assume major responsibilities for this function within and between their offices. These mid-management personnel should also be on similar levels of authority so as to move freely within and across the agencies and be able to deal with and be recognized by the established power structure. When it comes to the actual activities, the resources of the organization should be available to accomplish the tasks.

Many different types of activities have been identified and/or recommended for implementation as a result of the thrust for the development of interagency agreements. However, before developing specific activities, New York conducted a needs assessment (1979) of the service

providers, to insure that the impressions and/or perceptions of the state were concurrent with the issues and concerns of the local program implementors. The needs assessment was carried out through the following sequence of events:

1. Local service providers; special education directors and teachers, occupational education directors and teachers, and vocational rehabilitation office managers and counselors were invited to attend one of seven regional workshops during the Spring of 1979 to provide their input to the issues and concerns, relative to the provision of a cooperative continuum of services for handicapped learners.

2. At the workshop, the participants engaged in a series of activities which generated data around five categories; Communication/Information, Policies and Procedures, Resources (Human and other), Program (K to Adult), and Attitudes.

3. After each workshop, the results were disseminated to the participants. All reports were then reviewed and a summary produced and forwarded to all workshop participants.

The data provided the base for the establishment of some short-term activities and long-term strategies to properly implement the concept of interagency cooperation.

One short-term activity scheduled for the Spring of 1980 is to expand the data base gathered from the service providers. A series of eight forums will be held across the state where the invited audience will be administrators who provide the service, the receivers of this service and/or their advocates, and the employment community. This information will be added to the previously gathered data to provide a comprehensive base for the development of an appropriate continuum of services for handicapped learners.

The planning and development of interagency cooperation requires addressing several concerns. A list of concerns or elements that are important for the implementation of an ongoing process include:

1. Commitment by the appropriate individuals in the power structure; In New York State, the Assistant Commissioners in Special Education, Occupational Education and Vocational Rehabilitation have established this commitment supported by the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Regents.

2. Leadership - those making the commitment must provide direct leadership for the concept and staff.

3. Identification of specific individuals at an appropriate level of authority to carry out the leadership function within and across the offices involved.

4. Establishment of the appropriate data base to insure that the activities are based on actual need rather than perceived need; New York State conducted seven workshops to gather data from local providers. A follow-up with receivers and employers is planned.

5. Providing the opportunity for the staffs of each office to become involved in the commitment; New York State involved the office staffs as participants and facilitators during their data gathering activities.

6. Development of an awareness of the goals, functions, and staffs in the offices involved; New York State conducted three one-day seminars whereby a portion of each office staff was involved in an exchange of information and interaction about each office.

7. Development of a directory of the various offices involved and identification of the function and types of services available.

8. Initial implementation of the activities which are viable and visable so that all concerned can see that the commitment is real and ongoing.

9. Development of joint state level policy statements which address those items that are seen to impede cooperative efforts on the local level; New York is developing such papers in the areas of:

a. Individualized Education Program (IEP) - involvement by vocational education and vocational rehabilitation personnel.

b. Individualized Education Program - Individualized Work Rehabilitation Plan (IWRP) Coordination.

c. Committee on the Handicapped (COH) involvement by vocational education and vocational rehabilitation personnel when appropriate.

d. Vocational assessment of students prior to recommendation for placement in a specific vocational education program.

e. Interaction between the various advisory councils.

10. Dissemination of the findings, plans, and activities across a wide spectrum of audiences; New York State provided a copy of the findings, plans, and activities to each participant at the seven regional workshops. A summary was developed and shared with all seven workshop participants and various groups and agencies in the state and nation.

11. Do not include the universe until you are certain that you are ready to deal with an additional element of that universe.

12. Recognize the human elements of attitude, perception, level of commitment, and others that will impact on the process and progress.

Additional items will probably be identified by others and as the pool of knowledge expands, the list will lengthen and solidify.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison is currently involved in a national interagency cooperation study and is developing a resource manual for linking agencies serving the handicapped (Tindall, 1979). Identified in Section VII are additional items that should be reviewed when attempting to identify critical areas in linkage. Included are such items as: attitudinal factors, preconditions and facilitators that con-

tribute to success, categories that influence the development and maintenance of interagency linkages, barriers and incentives to cooperation, and methods for reducing risk. The Wisconsin document also provides, in Section VI, a guide on "Procedures for Developing Linkages." A comprehensive checklist of the components of a model cooperative agreement constitute the major portion of this section.

CONCLUSION

Mandates for cooperation are reasonably well established in legislation and regulation, and the federal agencies have initiated activities to promote the development of interagency agreements. However, no apparent attempt has been made to determine if there are inhibitors to the process contained in the regulations and policies. A comprehensive review of the documents has to be made so that a continuum of cooperative planning, program implementation, and funding can be made available in the most cost-effective way. The coordination of monies and the cross-over of populations are probably the two major areas which need immediate attention.

In summary, there is one factor which will control the entire process and Dr. James J. Gallagher, the first Associate Commissioner in the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, said it best in 1968:

> "Cooperation is a lot easier to talk about than to achieve. We need the feeling of security and mutual respect, so that as someone has said, there will not be the feeling that we are 'doing' while the other group is 'operating.' To attain this elusive goal, we must fight off the most negative of human emotions ... that is, suspicion of other professional groups, concerns for our own insecurities and worries about potential loss of state and prestige (Singletary, 1973)."

REFERENCES

Kahn, H. and Weiner, A., The Year 2000, A Framework for Speculation on the Next 33 Years, The MacMillan Company, New York, New York, 1967.

Krantz, G. and Weatherman, R., National Survey of State Special Needs Personnel Serving Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students in Vocational Education, St. Paul, Minnesota, Division of Educational Administration, University of Minnesota, 1975.

National workshop for the Development of Comprehensive Secondary Programming and Rehabilitation Services for the Handicapped. Cooperative Planning for the Handicapped. Washington, D.C. 1979.

Ottmar, C., Proceedings of the Workshop on Optimum Use of Similar Benefits; Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute, Center for Social Research and Development, Denver Research Institute, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado, 1979.

Singletary, Ernest E., A Review of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 as Related to the Handicapped, (ED 083 447), 1973.

The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department. Services for the Handicapped Linking Special Education, Occupational Education, and Vocational Rehabilitation, Albany, New York, 1979.

Tindall, Lloyd W., draft copy, Resource Manual: Vocational Education Models for Linking Agencies Serving the Handicapped. Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, 1979.

Young, Earl B., Vocational Education for Handicapped Persons - Handbook for Program Implementation. Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1969.

Training Educational Personnel to Implement Effective Interagency Cooperation and Agreements for Serving Handicapped Learners

by

Don E. McNelly
Associate Professor
Department of Vocational-Technical Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

INTRODUCTION

The history of American education is the long, turbulent record of a nation that was not afraid to risk failure, trouble, or confusion in pursuit of a goal that at first seemed wildly impractical: to give every American child a chance to develop to the limits of his ability. It is still one of the most radical ideas in human history, yet it has prospered and grown (Gardner, 1968). We find ourselves confessing ... yes, we are still struggling to educate every child to enable him to develop and enjoy a useful and productive life in a free society. As long as we continue to serve all citizens to the best of our ability in a complex changing society, there will always be room for changes and improvements.

Today in education, several factors are strongly forcing education to realize that it must be both reactive and proactive in meeting these forces in our society. Accountability to the public has caused us to operate openly and responsibly. The shrinking tax dollar is coming under more and more demands for services which cause the civil servants to search more diligently for alternative ways. At the same time, the edicts from legislation and court cases compress the time for action

in areas that we may or may not have been prepared for making appropriate responses. In the past, we were able to function in our own area with some self-satisfied sense of accomplishments. Now, we are recognizing the values of interagency cooperation and agreements to be more tax efficient and able to deliver the services more effectively for the citizens.

Can program improvement through interagency cooperation and agreement at the federal, state, and local levels be brought about? Are there strategies and activities that enable program administrators and planners to structure for desired change? Educators can no longer be content to "allow" change to occur. Strategies must be implemented so that change can be planned, directed, and controlled (Hershey and Blanchard, 1978). Change is not new to education and government. During the previous two hundred years of our nation's existence, schools have been called upon to respond to numerous societal needs and expectations. Change has been so continuous, rapid, and extensive that it has inhibited and nullified measurable progress in some instances (Hobbs, 1976). What is new is the sharply increasing rate at which changes are occurring. A major issue at hand is being prepared for this accelerated rate of change with the needs of the people in mind. If sight of our goals is lost in meeting the needs of the people, decay is inevitable. Interagency cooperation and agreements, at the federal, state, and local levels must be conducted in such a way as to maximize resources and to minimize real and/or imagined barriers.

EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS

A limited telephone survey of recognized leaders in the field suggested that there are few comprehensive interagency cooperation and agreements training programs. Marc Hull, the Associate Director of Special Education for Vermont, reported much success and satisfaction with their state and local level interagency efforts in Vermont. However, their success was due to a real commitment to time, patience, and involvement at all delivery levels for interfacing and participatory processes. One program was initiated in another state that did not include all levels. The initial efforts were focused at the local level. Interagency plans and activities generated at the local level quickly diminished when brought to the state level where key members did not identify with the local activities.

The process reported by Robert LaCasse of New York does provide for input from the local practitioners which have been synthesized into five topical areas of concern. These areas are being covered across the state in a series of eight, three-hour forums. Five panel members are presenting and then interacting with the participants.

The Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center (1979) has a resource manual that is currently in development. The range of linkage activities included those from advocacy groups to the federal agency level. Two national research projects were identified as being outstanding, the Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute at the University of Denver (RRRI) and the Research Utilization Laboratory (RUL) of the Chicago Jewish Vocational Services. The RUL reports draw conclusions about

how service providers cooperate. The RRRI reviews and assesses the state of the art of interagency relationships involving vocational rehabilitation and other major service providers for the disabled.

Three model projects were also identified which relate to linking agencies serving the handicapped. Project SERVE has been in the St. Paul, Minnesota area since 1970-71, and has been directly involved in fourteen projects and thirty more following the concept. SERVE is an acronym for the state agencies involved: Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Vocational Education. District 916, Area Vocational-Technical Institute in White Bear Lake, Minnesota has a project SERVE which is a direct service and administrative program for the coordination of program and fiscal resources for the handicapped on the local and state levels.

The Institute for Educational Leadership at George Washington University has the "Education of the Handicapped Policy Project" that is funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. The project is designed to assist the development of educational policies necessary to implement the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975.

The third project identified and discussed in the Wisconsin Resource Manual was "Implementation of a Model to Faciltate Direct Provisions of Services among Seven Agencies." The project is funded by the Wisconsin Association for Developmental Disabilities and the Association for Retarded Citizens in Wisconsin.

A five-volume publication is also in development by the Regional Resource Center Task Force on Interagency Collaboration which is funded by the Learning Resources Branch, Bureau of Education for the

Handicapped. The five volumes which are in sequential order include: A Guide to State Level Planning and Development; A Guide to Local Implementation; A Guide to Federal Policies and Agreements Regarding Vocationally-Oriented Education and Rehabilitation Programs; and Annotated Bibliography and Glossary of Acronyms and Terms. The format used in Volumes I and II are very specific and arranged by strategies which are further broken down into Tasks. Each Task is subdivided into three areas which include: Assumptions and Considerations, Suggested Activities, and Examples and References.

Phelps and Thornton (1979) identified five critical inservice training needs for state leaders from a national survey of 153 state leadership personnel. These initial inservice needs have been used to develop short-term training institutes for state leaders as follows:

- Interagency planning and service delivery,
- Individualized education programming,
- Inservice and preservice personnel development,
- Least restrictive environment programming, and
- Prevocational education.

THEORETICAL BASE

Interagency cooperation efforts for state and local level educational and service personnel need a theoretical framework to be successful. Long lasting success with interagency cooperation and agreements at all levels cannot be expected by imposing or forcing others to comply. The literature is not abundant with theory from the social sciences to guide the planners. However, the models which have been tested against different theories do mandate the selection of a theory for guidance.

Changes and Organizational Behavior

One very powerful and effective theory suggested as a framework for interagency cooperation is the field of change and organizational behavior. The theories of Lewin (1961), Hershey and Blanchard (1968), and Leavitt (1968), are appropriate for consideration.

Administrative decisions related to improvement activities for interagency cooperation and agreement require that changes occur. Improvement activities suggest, at the very minimum, a movement from "what is" to "what is desired." This does not imply that the previous way was necessarily bad. "Better" ways are likely to be "different" ways. But if the end-product, an enlightened society, is to be rapidly and effectively attained, "the different" ways will have to be carefully selected and effectively implemented (Hobbs, 1976).

Any planned change for institutions staffed with people calling for a different approach in conducting their work, especially those calling for interagency functions, must consider a matrix of factors characteristic for the particular cases. These factors may be called driving and restraining forces. Once it has been determined that a discrepancy exists, then force field analysis may become a helpful tool. The driving forces are what a person has going for himself in a change effort, and restraining forces are what a person has going against himself. Sometimes we find ourselves having to analyze and formulate a strategy as the result of a court case or new legislation. In those cases, a person does not have the luxury of preplanning for change but finds himself struggling with a new set of rules. Whether he makes the decision or is handed one, the problems are the same.

Force field analysis helps decision makers to contrast driving forces and restraining forces. It graphically identifies specific factors which are occurring and suggests what kind of forces are more powerful. Hershey and Blanchard (1978) recommended the following guidelines that may be used: (1) If driving forces far out-weigh restraining forces in power and frequency in a change situation, managers interested in driving for change can often push on and overpower the restraining forces; and, (2) If the reverse is true and restraining forces are much stronger than the driving forces, managers interested in driving for change have several alternatives. First, decision makers can give up the change effort, realizing that desired change will be too difficult to implement. Second, they can pursue the change effort but concentrate on maintaining the driving forces in the situation while attempting, one by one, either to convert individual restraining forces into driving forces or somehow immobilize each of the restraining forces so that they are no longer factors in the situation. The second choice is possible but very time consuming. Third, if the driving forces and restraining forces are fairly equal in a change situation, managers probably will have to begin pushing the driving forces, and at the same time attempting to convert or immobilize some or all of the restraining forces. Once the force field has been analyzed, an understanding of the levels of change and the change cycles would be useful.

Change Cycles

There are four levels of change: knowledge, attitudinal, individual behavior, and group or organizational performance. The degree of

difficulty in changing behavior ranges from the easiest to the most difficult. Knowledge may change as a result of reading a book or hearing a reputable person. Attitudes are positive or negative in an emotional way and as a result are more difficult to change. The change in individual behavior is more difficult and time consuming than the two previous listed levels. The change becomes even more complicated when trying to implement changes within groups.

Two change cycles, the participative change cycle and the directive change cycle, are both appropriate strategies depending on the situation. There are advantages and disadvantages to each change cycle. When new knowledge is made known through research, findings, new theories, and others, a participative change cycle is implemented. Through these new inputs, the administrator desires a shift in attitude and commitment in the direction of the desired change. The process becomes participative when an individual or a group participates in problem solving while identifying new methods for obtaining the desired goals.

The next step is more difficult to attain, and that is translating commitment to behavior. It is one thing to say yes, I am convinced that interagency participation is necessary and then to actually get involved in doing. A leader may call together the various agency commissioners and other key personnel and concentrate on gaining their action (behavior) for the desired change. Once subordinates and co-workers observe the changes in behavior of their leaders, they may begin to pattern their behavior accordingly.

Directive change is begun by an administrator or leader as a result of their respective position powers. The change cycle is imposed on the total group or organization. The interaction network at the individual level will be affected. New individual behavior, in some cases, creates the kind of knowledge that develops commitment to the change. Individual and group behavior will be reinforced, hopefully, in the desired direction.

If there is a choice between the two change cycles, which one should be selected? Is there one best strategy for implementing change? Where there was no interagency agreements or cooperation in the past, what strategy should be chosen? Effective change agents are identified as those who can adapt their strategies to the demands of their unique environments (Hershey & Blanchard, 1978).

Advantages and disadvantages of change cycles may be integrated into the selection process. Diagnosis before action may be the difference between success or failure. For people with a high degree of experience and success, and who are capable of assuming responsibilities for implementing change, the participative change cycle may be the most appropriate. A directive change style that is not consistent with the group's self perceptions could cause resistance and conflict. For people who are less ambitious, more dependent, and unwilling unless forced to take new responsibilities, the directive change style may be the most appropriate and productive. Previous experience by a group also enters into the selection of an appropriate change strategy or cycle.

Each change cycle lends itself to a power base -- personal or position. The participative change cycle is effective when exercised by a leader with personal power. A person enjoys personal power when he is well liked and respected by his peers regardless of position power. The directive change cycle requires that the leader have position power. A person with position power is one who has control over rewards, punishments, and sanctions.

For long-lasting effects, the participative change cycle offers a significant advantage once the change is acceptable. The disadvantages for the participative approach is that it may take years to implement a significant change. The directive change cycle has the advantage of immediate change. However, the change can be maintained only as long as the leader has position power. The directive cycle also has other disadvantages. It may result in animosity and hostility to overt and covert actions. These two change cycle approaches should not be considered as one method for each personality. The exclusive use of only one approach could lead to several problems. A combination of the two cycles would be more preferable while considering the specific situation.

APPLICATION

The stage has been set at the federal level for providing the foundation upon which to build subsequent agreements at the state and local levels. Increased awareness by the public concerning services, cost effectiveness, and efficiencies are helping to forge a conservative reaction by legislators. They are demanding impact of services plus

eliminating redundant activities before granting new or continued funding. Auditors are searching for evidence pertaining to interagency cooperation and agreements. Astute administrators should demonstrate how their agency has provided services to a target population in cooperation with other agencies by reducing costs while increasing services. In the preface of Volume I of the Interagency Collaboration on Full Services for Handicapped Children and Youth, the sobering thoughts are stated in English that everyone can understand.

> "Another more basic way of looking at the interagency collaborator thrust is that it is now becoming more and more likely that if you are doing the same job as someone else, you're both going to be found out -- and one of you may have to go. It then begins to make more practical sense to begin working together to get the whole job done for your clientele, so you can keep your jobs!"

The authors also recognize and bring to light some real inhibitors such as turfdom and local education agency politics.

Barriers and Facilitators

Some of the major compelling forces have been identified as barriers and facilitators by Baumheier (1979). He conducted an extensive review of the academic social science literature in the field of interorganizational behavior. After reviewing the practical applied research at the programmatic level of government-sponsored research and demonstration projects, he identified the following barriers and facilitators:

Barriers:

- inadequate understanding of other agencies' service roles operating procedures, organizational channels, and proper points of staff contact in regard to client services;

- mandates to coordinate or use similar benefits of another agency are most frequently one-sided, counterpart agencies may not have similar mandates to collaborate in the provision of service to clients;
- insufficient communication among service delivery personnel and supervisors at the client level;
- lack of interagency case planning, management, and follow-up;
- inadequate staff training in interagency work with multi-problem clients;
- lack of administrative leadership and orientation towards cooperation at substate and supervisory levels;
- difference in agency policies and philosophies;
- interpersonal problems resulting from poor agency cooperation in the past;
- resentment of requirements for cooperation superimposed from the above;
- differing expectations of progress or success for clients; and
- perceived threats to agency autonomy.

Facilitators:

- development of state agency capacity for comprehensive services planning;
- top-level administrative commitment to the principles and practices of interagency cooperation, with such commitment clearly visible and credible to staff members through both agencies;
- opportunities for professional workers to express their doubts and concerns about the cooperative program;
- good experiences in the actual implementation of joint programs and successful service delivery to clients;
- legitimacy of the interagency planning and programs by general purpose government;
- frequent communication among participants in joint programs, especially at the supervisory and direct service provider levels;
- mutual participation in decision making regarding the joint effort;

- clear delineation of details of operating procedures, information flow in both directions, and mutual goals for clients;
- continuous monitoring and evaluation, with appropriate mechanisms for solving problems as they arise; and
- allocation of sufficient staff time and other resources to the development and implementation of the joint program.

Working With Educational Personnel

The directive change cycle has already been set into motion by the interagency cooperation and agreement statements, first from the federal level and now the state level. What remains is implementation at the local level. The degree of difficulty of this task is a direct function of similar traditional agency tasks. Vocational education stands apart from the other agencies as a unique cog in the gear. It is a specialized form of education that must not get into the arena competing with special education and/or vocational rehabilitation. Each area is highly specialized and staffed with mature and intelligent members. The research theory tells us that the most appropriate change cycle for these members would be the participative. However, for those in the field that are unambitious and unwilling to change, some directive change cycle rhetoric and action is probably necessary.

In traditional school systems, the vocational education community has for the most part been acted upon rather than participating in designing and developing educational programs for handicapped learners. The lead agency which assumes the responsibility for providing leadership to educational programs for the handicapped has been, and justifiably so, special education. Vocational rehabilitation delivers spe-

cific services to qualified clients. Education tends to deliver more general services. It should be obvious that we have not been able to fully operationalize appropriate vocational education for handicapped learners. Several historical factors remain to be solved before realizing marginal success.

Degree granting institutions have not fully structured their course requirements to bring about a better understanding of the various disciplines. State certification and licensing requirements for the initial or renewal certificates are not mandating experiences which integrate the disciplines. State inservice programs have not been designed to bring the various disciplines together. These problems will not go away on their own. They are, in all probability, going to change very slowly. The most economical, efficient, and expedient vehicle to integrate the disciplines is proper inservice. Educational personnel are not going to be able to implement effective interagency functions without the inservice delivery system. Locally conducted programs by local personnel have the promise of immediacy. However, leaders who are not educated on interagency roles, expectations, limitations, and potential can become misinformed.

The burden of responsibility and leadership, for education of the handicapped in general, rests with special education. Local special education leaders should receive first consideration in order to initiate appropriate vocational education for the handicapped. An intensive orientation to vocational education combined with some "hands-on" experiences is a beginning. This phase would be particularly beneficial

to those who have never worked in an occupation other than education. These intensive experiences could serve as a foundation for understanding what vocational education is about. Secondly, these leaders should be able to interface with the various vocational instructors on local visits to industry that are scheduled throughout the year. These visits could enable the vocational instructor and the special educator to identify specific entry level skills needed for employment.

The special educator and/or the vocational instructor are sometimes unaware of the specific entry-level requirements by industry for the prospective handicapped worker. Local vocational instructors have been taught to prepare their students for entry level rather than broad ranges of skills within their curriculum area. This is one area where vocational rehabilitation may have some experiences and expertise. By working together, it would be possible to identify local industry entry requirements which would, in turn, enable local special education leaders to make better informed decisions. The decision about placing a handicapped student into vocational education is not complete until placement into work is considered. The system of local industry visits could generate a handbook for counseling purposes. Without the specific targeted educational goal, the local vocational education instructor will not be able to know what to emphasize and how to set realistic learning experiences and expectations for handicapped learners.

Before a handicapped student is placed into a vocational education program, some knowledge is necessary pertaining to cognitive, psychomotor and attitudinal skills needed to enter and succeed in a regular

program. Without this knowledge, realistic decisions about initial placements of handicapped learners into vocational programs are impossible. Generally, this knowledge does not exist on the local level. The local vocational instructors are sometimes unaware of these requirements. In a participatory manner with vocational rehabilitation and special education, these skills can be identified, synthesized, and program standards can be a bench mark for subsequent educational goals and plans for the handicapped learner.

A fourth area for preparing personnel to work together is actual placement into jobs. This area is perhaps the real test for the entire educational experience of each handicapped learner. The prevailing practices, with respect to placement activities within the vocational area, are generally inadequate. The local vocational instructors are usually not given release time during the school year or an extended contract to develop placements. Traditional special education personnel are not commonly schooled to place their students into employment following the classroom experiences. However, vocational rehabilitation has much experience and expertise in making placements. Together, the three agencies would be better able to deliver vocational services to handicapped learners.

Most of the identified problems are opportunities for cooperation. However, they will remain as barriers until a strategy is formulated whereby all parties can participate in jointly identifying, planning, and operationalizing the delivery of an appropriate education for handicapped learners.

Delivering Educational Services

The potential for higher educational institutions to provide the necessary educational services to handicapped learners is varied. Not all vocational teacher educators are fully philosophically or operationally committed to integrating the handicapped into ongoing vocational education programs. Many instructors are dedicated to one area within vocational education and do not conceptualize comprehensively across vocational education. Funding inservice programs directed by these individuals may not be the best approach.

Increasingly, there is hostility between state departments of education and institutions of higher education. Whether by design or default, the communication process is not effective. Some state level people are insisting on service commitment even after removing the funds to support higher education. The teacher educators are increasingly being called upon to justify their position with credit hours generated or to contract with outside agencies for funds. Inservice is becoming impossible without the special funds. The local school systems are not going to be effectively served on an inservice basis by higher education if no funds are made available.

Effective Educational Process

The poorer an attitude, the stronger the catalyst must be to shift the attitude to bring about the desired change in behavior. While much can be accomplished at the local level, perhaps more drastic action is required to thaw the turf. As long as people remain in their immediate

environments, there is strong resistance to change. The following is a suggested change process:

> Remove an individual from the home educational environment. Place him with others in a new setting. Create learning experiences which will chip away at the old and build upon the desired new. Design interfacing opportunities in which the new is reinforced and a potential change agent exists to operate as a center of influence at the local level.

This is greatly simplified but necessary to change existing attitudes and practices. Once changed, it is possible to shape and adjust to the desired point of view.

CONCLUSION

Administrators at all levels are being pressed to comply with mandated changes. At the same time they are expected to remain conservative in committing their scarce resources for cooperative ventures. The complex institutions providing services to the handicapped can be guided more effectively through a change process by benefiting from the research literature on interorganizational behavior.

Personnel can be taught how to implement effective interagency cooperation and agreements in serving the handicapped. Effective long range changes require active participation by personnel to identify, internalize, and formulate new behaviors.

Through participation, the talents of the various agencies can come together as a unifying force, greatly increasing the quantity and quality of appropriate vocational education for the handicapped. Compliance through sanctions from positions of power are not in the best interest of serving the handicapped. Interagency cooperation and agreements

can be approached in an effective participatory process for educating personnel, or everyone can continue in their separate disciplines and agencies going their separate paths seeking ways to catch and hold "vanishing vapors."

REFERENCES

Baumheier, Edward C. Interagency Cooperation and Utilization of Similar Benefits in the Delivery of Vocational Rehabilitation Services. Denver, Colorado: Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute, Center for Social Research and Development, University of Denver, 1979.

Gardner, John W. No Easy Victories. Helen Rowan (Ed.), New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Hershey, Paul, and Blanchard, Kenneth H. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources (3rd ed.), New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1978.

Hobbs, Addison. How We Can Provide Vocational Education for Special Groups. In James E. Wall (Ed.), Vocational Education for Special Groups, Sixth Year Book, Washington, D.C.: American Vocational Association, 1976.

Interagency Collaboration on Full Services for Handicapped Children and Youth (5 Vols.). Interagency Task Force, Regional Resource Centers, in press.

Leavitt, Harold. Perception: From the Inside Looking Out. In D.R. Hampton, C.E. Summer and R.A. Webber (Eds.), Organizational Behavior and the Practice of Management, Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968.

Lewin, Kurt. Quasi-Stationary Social Equilibria and the Problem of Permanent Change. In W.G. Bennis, K.D. Benne and R. Chin (Eds.), The Planning of Change: Readings in the Applied Behavioral Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.

McNelly, Dor[illegible] E. Extern Strategy for Vocational Leadership Training. Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Southern Region Distributive Education Conference, 1977.

Phelps, L.A., and Thornton, L.J. Vocational Education and Handicapped Learners: Perceptions and Inservice Needs of State Leadership Personnel. Urbana: Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education, University of Illinois, Pennsylvania State University, 1979.

Tindall, Lloyd W., Gugerty, John J., Crowley, Carol B., Getzel, Elizabeth Evans, Ostby, and Carol Cohen. Vocational Education Models for Linking Agencies Serving the Handicapped. Madison: Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison, in press.

Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel for Working with Students Who have Special Needs

by

Ray Sankovsky
Associate Professor
Department of Vocational and Adult Education
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama

INTRODUCTION

Effective and efficient personnel preparation is vital in the programs and services for disabled youth and adults on their pathway to employment. Numerous reports at the national, state, and local levels have documented not only the importance of personnel preparation for special needs, but also noted the significant limitations and the frequent absence of this preparation.

Concerns and issues regarding personnel preparation range from administrative and financial support for both the preservice and inservice components, to the competencies, skills, and knowledges needed by personnel who work with students who have special needs. This paper will focus on personnel preparation with regard to some common myths, critical issues and concerns, some components for building models for preservice and inservice personnel preparation, the role of interdisciplinary training, and the nature of personnel trainers.

SOME MYTHS ABOUT PERSONNEL PREPARATION

Vocational Teachers are Insensitive to the Needs of Special Students

Vocational teachers are sometimes alleged to be insensitive to the needs of special students. Although this statement has been repeated frequently, it has little documented support. In reality, vocational teachers lack adequate and appropriate training to work with the special student. Long before the legislation, students who did not demonstrate potential for post-secondary training were routinely channeled through the counseling programs into vocational education. Vocational teachers were assigned the responsibility to prepare many of these students for a productive life, without the necessary preservice or inservice training. With the additional emphasis on mainstreaming, even more students are programmed into vocational education, but still the personnel preparation for the vocational teacher with respect to special needs remains only marginal.

Everyone Should be Trained on an Interdisciplinary Basis

Interagency agreements have existed on a formal basis since the late 1960's, and much earlier on an informal basis in some exemplary programs. Many of these agreements have simply been compliance documents, with little or no active participation. The desire of a service provider for the handicapped in vocational programs is to be thoroughly versed in special education, vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, and other human service disciplines. The reality is that

even within a single discipline there is a need for better personnel preparation. From an historical standpoint, special education has focused on a primary and elementary preparation, and the special education teacher with a genuine and sound preparation in secondary programs is generally not available.

With regard to the preparation of vocational teachers, the required coursework in core areas and courses needed for certification often restricts the amount of coursework the undergraduate vocational teacher can take in his or her content area. In some vocational education preparation programs the student may not even have the option of taking elective coursework in cross-disciplinary training. Vocational rehabilitation preparation in the areas of counselor training or facility specialist training, does not provide enough crossover in interdisciplinary preparation within the rehabilitation discipline itself.

The question concerning the extent of interdisciplinary training and who should be involved has not been adequately researched or documented for any practical application. Therefore, the natural or "safe" response is to continue to pressure for interdisciplinary or interagency personnel preparation across the board.

The Primary Emphasis for Vocational Teacher Preparation Should be On Vocational Evaluation or Assessment

When the vocational special needs person evolved a few years back, there was a need to develop a personnel preparation component. In the early days, this emphasis focused heavily on vocational evaluation or assessment simply because this training was established. There

were individuals around who could provide the training, but few seemed to know exactly what to provide the vocational teacher in a personnel preparation program that focused on special needs. Vocational evaluation or assessment is critical in the effective placement of handicapped individuals into appropriate programs, and is a process the vocational teachers should understand. However, it is not the prime responsibility of the vocational teacher to perform vocational assessment, but rather to provide the necessary skills and knowledges to students for entry-level employment. Special needs coursework for vocational teachers must focus on applied methods, techniques, and resources to facilitate skills and knowledge acquisition.

All We Need is a Course or a Workshop

One common misconception held particularly by administrative personnel is that a quick one-day, one-week, or one-course training effort will make interdisciplinary experts. Some states are requiring either by law or board of education resolutions to provide a course in exceptionality as part of the certification requirements for educational personnel. Although this is a step in the right direction, it is by no means a solution to the dilemma of interdisciplinary training.

We Need to Conduct More Studies on Teacher Competencies

There are two basic flaws with this statement: First, perhaps more competency and performance studies have been conducted than are needed, and second, a list of competencies or performances to work with special needs students would be prohibitive in an interdisciplinary

personnel preparation model. Additional discussion will be provided on competencies and performances in a later section of this paper.

Our Service Providers Need to be Sensitized to the Laws and Regulations

It is difficult to read articles, project reports and manuscripts or attend workshops or conferences in the area of vocational special needs without an overabundance of references to the laws, regulations, responsibilities, and consequences for not providing appropriate and effective vocational education to handicapped youth. Telling people about the laws and the consequences does not have as significant an impact on their behaviors as showing them what to do, and providing information and resources on how to more effectively work with the special student.

CONCERNS AND ISSUES

Following is a list of issues and concerns regarding personnel preparation for special needs as compiled from the consensus or survey reports issued by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Pathways I Conference (1976), President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Pathways II Conference (1979), NASBE State of the Art (1979), and NAVESNP Teacher Education Committee (1979). Many of the issues and concerns will be discussed more directly in the body of this paper.

1. Existing certification standards may be irrelevant or may vary from state to state. There is a need to amend teacher certification requirements in each state as needed to assure that personnel serving handicapped students receive interdisciplin-

ary training covering special education and vocational education.

2. Regular educator, related school personnel, and key instructors (i.e., vocational and career-oriented personnel) need more skills than can be transmitted in a 3 or 5 hour mainstream course.

3. Special educators trained in elementary programs are not adequately prepared to serve the needs of secondary level handicapped students.

4. Regular education and related school personnel (i.e., subject area teachers, grade level teachers, counselors, administrators, and school staff personnel) should be skilled with respect to teaching, interacting, and adapting materials or programs to meet the needs of handicapped students.

5. Teacher educators who prepare vocational teachers are not adequately informed regarding the development of programs for handicapped students.

6. Teacher education programs have so many priorities and core areas of coursework that it is very difficult to develop and implement new coursework in the preservice program that is directed to vocational special needs.

7. A non-supportive attitude exists by educational administrators for the education, training, and placement of handicapped populations.

8. There is a lack of inservice and staff development in interagency planning.

9. There is a lack of inservice training in interdisciplinary decision-making for key service personnel and human service systems planners, and a need to provide awareness training to administrators and other key personnel.

10. During the past several years numerous new university programs have developed across the country concerning teacher training and special needs. We do not have enough qualified personnel to adequately fill these vacancies.

11. Vocational teachers often do not have the time to identify and locate materials and resources that would assist them in teaching special needs students.

12. Special education personnel are not adequately prepared to work effectively with handicapped students in vocational programs.

13. Vocational Rehabilitation is decreasing its role in the vocational education programs for handicapped students, because of conflict with "similar benefits."

SOME CONSIDERATIONS FOR DEVELOPING PERSONNEL PREPARATION MODELS

Inservice vs. Preservice

Inservice. From an immediacy standpoint, inservice training is the most critical. Practicing vocational teachers must be provided the necessary staff development and continuing education if the desired and required program outcomes for handicapped youth in vocational education are to be realized. This is particularly true for many of the teachers in the trade, technical, and industrial areas. Many of these teachers are employed without academic degrees or coursework but on the basis of work-related experience, and the completion of a sequence of special certification courses. An attempt should be made to update the certification requirements for these teachers, and to incorporate special needs coursework in the certification requirements. Otherwise they will only be exposed to vocational special needs in inservice training sessions or workshops.

Inservice training for practicing teachers who have had no preservice coursework should include a sequence of inservice training programs developed through a coordinated involvement with university and state agency personnel. The content and format for this inservice training will be discussed in a later section. If inservice personnel preparation is to be developed and offered, the only assurance for con-

sistent, appropriate, and effective state-wide training is the total involvement of state agency staff development and university personnel. In too many situations there is a dichotomy of service, with university personnel assuming preservice responsibilities and state agency personnel inservice responsibilities.

Preservice. Inservice has been designated as the most critical training emphasis. However, without a concerted effort in preservice preparation there will be an ongoing reliance on inservice training. In preservice preparation a question often raised is, "Where do you put the training, and how do you develop and include new coursework in already overloaded courses of study?" Perhaps the most realistic response for preservice preparation is to provide as much of the training and experience on a "course infusion" basis. Existing course outlines should be updated and revised so as to incorporate the emphasis on teaching vocational special needs. The "course infusion" method is realistic in that it incorporates special needs as part of the regular program of study. It is practical because it does not require the development of several new courses. In some cases a single introductory course to vocational special needs can provide an overview that would facilitate the "course infusion" process.

The relative success and effectiveness of special needs coursework at the undergraduate level has not been thoroughly researched or documented. One observed and self-reported effect by vocational teachers in preservice programs, is that the training or instruction they receive in special needs does not have an impact until the teacher

has been on the job for approximately six months and has experienced some of the problem situations. With this consideration, ample resource information in the form of handouts, documents, and other related materials should be provided during the preservice program so that it could be reviewed and used at a later date. An additional consideration would be to include new teachers in ongoing inservice workshops related to vocational special needs.

Competencies, Performances, and Content

Preservice preparation for teachers who have not had previous exposure in the classroom can realistically only deal with expectancies; "Here are some things that you will encounter and here are your alternatives to deal with these situations." Simulations in preservice programs are helpful, but guarantee no assurance of transfer of knowledge and information. On-site visits, practicums, and internships should be structured in preservice programs to assure that the student is exposed to some of the content covered through the "course infusion" process in relation to special needs.

Course content for vocational special needs is dictated by the competencies and performances expected of the teachers. Lists of competency and performance statements are available across the country. One of these includes a listing of 308 suggested competencies considered required by special educators and vocational educators in order to provide effective career education programs for the handicapped (Cook, 1978). Fowler and Midgett (1977) reported a listing of

90 special needs competencies ranked according to the degree of importance by vocational teachers and administrators.

Phelps (1976) provides a comprehensive review of the literature on competency based teacher education. Provided is an analysis of 49 tasks related to special needs that are perceived as important by teacher educators and local school personnel. Williams and Tarasuk (1977) developed lists of competencies needed by elementary, secondary, industrial educators, and career and guidance personnel that are perceived needed in order that they may function effectively in special needs education. Sankovsky (1977) reported a cluster of 9 competency areas that reflected approximately 80 competency statements identified by approximately 2,000 vocational teachers. There are numerous other competency and performance studies cited in the literature. Some studies are specific to a small population of vocational teachers, others are generic to the entire field of special needs.

In a previous section it was suggested that perhaps there have been too many competency studies conducted. The intent of this comment was that there are adequate lists from which to work, but there is still a need to somehow categorize, stratify, and define some of the skills and knowledges that are needed by the various service personnel in special needs on a (1) Must know and do, (2) Nice to know, and (3) Professional development, basis. Certainly there are critical competencies or minimally acceptable competencies that these service providers should demonstrate prior to working in special needs. These critical competencies are most likely universal and apply to all vocational educators, special educators, and rehabilitation personnel.

The classification process should address vocational education, special education, and vocational rehabilitation, teachers, counselors, coordinators, and administrators. The stratification scheme should address the relative importance of the competency or performance in terms of (1) Essential or must know, and (2) Nice to know, or (3) Professional development.

Staff Development Format

Brock (1980), in a national survey of special needs personnel preparation programs, reported that training institutions prepared vocational and special education personnel in a variety of program structures including programs that were extensions of existing teacher preparation programs, cooperatively staffed and separately housed programs, and programs that were completely independent and autonomous. Within this framework, courses or programs of study took many forms including course "add-on's," endorsement courses, certification required courses, or total programs of study including a sequence of established coursework leading to a degree.

The single course model in which a course is provided either on an elective basis or required by an endorsement of the State Board of Education or by law, has significant limitations if "course infusion" does not simultaneously occur. One course cannot prepare an individual from one discipline to function interactively or on a service basis to another discipline. Feedback from teachers participating in single course options indicated that additional courses or a sequence of cours-

es should be provided if the information and content related to special needs is not integrated into ongoing programs.

Sankovsky (1980), in an analysis of inservice programs, noted that workshops to prepare vocational teachers to work with special needs students have been developed and conducted across the country. These workshops, seminars, or inservice activities generally range in time from a few hours to several weeks, and have become the most popular approach for improving teacher skills and knowledge. The majority of these workshops have been limited to an awareness phase or the understanding of the special needs student. The assumption is that just knowing something about the special needs student will make a more effective teacher. In recent years, many of these inservice workshops have been directed to the mandates, responsibilities, and liabilities brought about by recent legislation on behalf of handicapped students.

There is little evidence that the continued emphasis on awareness type special needs workshops for vocational teachers will produce the necessary services and programs to effectively serve special needs students. Although there is a role for short-term special needs workshop training, it cannot substitute as the mechanism for the development of a coordinated and integrated teacher preparation program.

Sankovsky (1980) conducted a study concerning an analysis of the timing format of inservice workshops (i.e., a one-week workshop as opposed to an extended workshop). Vocational teacher responses were reported where the teachers participated on a weekly basis for a period

of 4 hours for 10 to 12 weeks. Eighty-four percent of workshop participants favored the extended workshop format. The particular problem in the extended time workshop is the availability of the teacher and the travel involved. Whenever feasible and practical, inservice training should be conducted on an extended time format. This will allow the teachers to return to the classroom between training sessions and test some of the information, techniques, or resources on an applied basis. This format permits the opportunity to provide feedback on the success of the materials or approaches. Materials and resources distributed during concentrated one-day, two-day, or one-week workshops have been found to be shelved or stored for later use, without an eventual application.

Materials and Resources

Perhaps one of the most frequent questions that vocational teachers ask relating to the vocational special needs student is: "Now that I have them -- what do I do with them?" As part of inservice training efforts for vocational teachers, an attempt should be made to answer this question in the most practical way. One alternative found to be effective is to provide information on resources and materials for the vocational teacher that he or she can use in the classroom. The Career Related Instruction (CRI) module package is one example of a resource that has been found to be practical and well accepted by many vocational teachers.

The CRI prevocational modules are a comprehensive set of student-oriented, individualized learning packets designed to provide information

on tools, terminology, skill operations, and vocational concepts for 34 occupations in two major occupational cluster areas. The modules are designed to provide high visual and low reading level content, with continuous feedback through the procedure of questions and answers. The CRI package is not intended to be used for vocational skill development but rather as an exploratory prevocational orientation to various occupations and occupational clusters.

The CRI package consists of over 1800 student learning modules written at the 3rd and 4th grade reading levels. Audio tapes of the modules can also be purchased for non-readers, and a set of filmstrips are available to accompany the occupational cluster areas. A teachers' manual provides answer keys and other supportive instructional materials.

There are sufficient resource materials that have been developed nationally in the areas of curriculum and curriculum modifications for working with special needs students. New materials and resources need not be developed until the existing materials have been reviewed and evaluated for application and appropriateness. A compilation of existing vocationally related curricular materials is currently being produced and reviewed as part of a federal project at the University of Wisconsin -- Madison. When this resource list is disseminated, it should provide a valuable resource to individuals responsible for personnel preparation in special needs.

PERSONNEL PREPARATION TRAINERS

Paerto, an 18th century economist, formulated the Law of Parsimony which stated that in a problem situation consisting of many smaller problems, the identification and solution of only a few of the major problems could resolve most of the problem situations. From a long range strategy perhaps one problem area which could account for the major deficits in personnel preparation for special needs is teacher educators and the personnel trainers themselves. Unless there is an adequate, well informed cadre of personnel trainers, the perpetuation of inappropriate and insufficient personnel preparation is assured. In a new and developing area of specialization it is difficult to find an adequate number of qualified personnel trainers. The primary backgrounds of each of these trainers or educators often assumes the major area or thurst of the training provided. Vocational rehabilitation personnel who enter the field of vocational special needs preparation frequently perceive the nature of the needed training as designed to address areas such as vocational assessment, adjustment services, and counseling. Special educators who cross over into vocational special needs bring the exploratory and facilitative emphasis, including such components as broad career exploration, and social and personal skills development. Vocational teachers who become involved in vocational special needs are often inclined to focus on their particular area of specialization. In addition, they sometimes modify and dilute the vocational content so that the handicapped student is not adequately challenged or prepared for entry-level occupations.

The coordination of all these disciplinary backgrounds is essential to an individual involved in personnel preparation. This will enable the prepared teachers to adequately provide the best possible vocational education services for handicapped students.

An Emerging Model

One model that is beginning to develop almost spontaneously across the country relates to the development of a specialist position to work with vocational teachers who work with handicapped students in vocational programs. In the State of Georgia this specialist is called a Resource Vocational Instructor (RVI). The job definition, role, and function for the RVI teacher, including additional certification coursework has been established and standardized across the State. There are more than 120 RVI teachers now employed in the local school systems in Georgia on a functional, cooperative agreement basis between special education and vocational education. Similar models are developing in other states. A critical concern in the development of the Resource Vocational Teacher is determining the person or persons responsible for staff development or personnel preparation.

INTERDISCIPLINARY TRAINING

Interdisciplinary or interagency training is only one component of the total cooperative interagency program. Interdisciplinary training can only be as successful as the degree to which the entire cooperative interdisciplinary effort is developed and operationalized. In 1972, a national education and rehabilitation conference was sponsored on an

interagency basis in Afton Mountain, Virginia. Commitments were made at this conference to conduct regional and state conferences to continue this cooperative effort. A 1975 follow-up of this conference revealed that only 6 of 50 states had conducted an interagency conference.

In October, 1977, the Commissioners of Education and Rehabilitation Services jointly issued a "Memorandum of Collaboration Between Education and Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies." A subsequent Memorandum was issued on the "Development of Formal Cooperative Agreements Between Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Vocational Education Programs to Maximize Services to Handicapped Individuals." The impact of these national level efforts has not been evaluated. However, for all practical purposes, the interdisciplinary movement has not been significantly improved. In some cases, as with vocational rehabilitation, there is not only a perceived but an actual erosion of cooperative rehabilitation school programs. Interdisciplinary training cannot develop and thrive in situations where the interagency cooperative efforts materialize only in the forms of informal agreements and memorandum.

CONCLUSION

Interdisciplinary preparation for working with handicapped students in vocational education programs is not a panacea, but a signficant move toward providing a total array of services, program options, potential skill training, and placement of handicapped students into productive roles in society. Interdisciplinary training needs to be provided by thoroughly knowledgeable and experienced trainers. The

most critical issues in this preparation process should be addressed now. Otherwise, handicapped students will continue to be routinely programmed through vocational education without the necessary skills and knowledges needed to engage in productive lifestyles. In addition, administrative sanctions and leadership responsiveness with respect to vocational special needs are essential if genuine interdisciplinary training is to be achieved.

REFERENCES

Brock, Robert. State of the Art--1977-1979: Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel to Work With Special Needs Students, University of Wisconsin-Stout, 1980.

Cook, Iva D. A Feasibility Study of the Need for Graduate Programs in Vocational Education for the Handicapped, West Virginia College of Graduate Studies, Institute, West Virginia, 1978.

Fowler, D., and Midgett J. An Appraisal of Vocational Education for Handicapped Persons in Florida, Florida Technological University, Orlando, Florida, 1977.

NASBE, State of the Art, National Association of State Boards of Education, Washington, D.C., 1979.

NAVESNP, Teacher Education Committee Report of Personnel Preparation, Unpublished document, 1979.

Phelps, L. Allen. Competency-Based Inservice Education for Secondary School Personnel Serving Special Needs Students in Vocational Education: A Formative Field Test Evaluation. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois, 1976.

President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Pathways to Employment, I, Washington, D.C., 1976.

President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Pathways to Employment, II, Washington, D.C., 1979.

Sankovsky, Ray. Providing Vocational Teachers With Competencies to Work With Special Needs Students, Vocational Education Department, Auburn University, 1980.

Sankovsky, Ray. Training Needs: An Analysis of a State-wide Survey of Vocational Teachers Who Work With Disadvantaged and Handicapped Students, Vocational Education Department, Auburn University, 1980.

Williams, M., and Tarasuk, P. A Summary Report of the Validation of Competencies Needed by Professional Personnel to Work With Students With Special Needs, Central Connecticut State College, New Britain, Connecticut, 1977.

Effective Linkages for Interagency Cooperation

by

Lloyd W. Tindall
Project Associate
Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center
University of Wisconsin-Madison

INTRODUCTION

Linkages among agencies serving handicapped people have been initiated from time-to-time during the last few years. Linkages usually were formed to help alleviate an existing problem in delivering services to handicapped people. The purpose of linking agencies serving handicapped people is to facilitate the delivery of services. A definition of linkage should describe that effective linkages involve agencies with a problem cooperating with other agencies to solve that problem.

Levine and White (1961) formulated that resources necessary for achieving an agency's objectives include clients, labor, equipment, knowledge about the services to be delivered, and funds. No one agency usually controls all of these elements, thus making interagency cooperation necessary. Agency problems arise when one or more of these elements are scarce. An agency must have a need if it is to engage in a cooperative effort with another agency.

The present national interest in linking agencies serving handicapped people has been given impetus from several sources. One source of this impetus is necessity. Some astute people realized early that interagency cooperation solved problems and made the job of delivering programs to handicapped people easier. Many of the earlier link-

ages involved informal relationships which were formed to help solve problems. No outside force demanded the linkage and no external rewards were given. It was just a natural method of achieving a common goal.

Today the political mood is demanding the conservation of resources. Legislation is demanding evidence of the effectiveness of expenditures. Handicapped students, their parents, and advocacy groups are demanding educational services which prepare students for jobs and careers. Federal legislation is now a dominant force in producing interagency agreements.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION AND INTERAGENCY LINKAGES

In the years from 1973 to 1976 a series of federal laws provided the impetus for agencies serving handicapped people to work together. The first of these, Public Law 93-112, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, had much to say about program and facility assessibility for handicapped students in vocational education. Among other things this act called for the following:

1. Handicapped people are to be educated with people who are not handicapped to the maximum extent appropriate to the needs of the handicapped person.
2. The needs of the handicapped person must be assessed by an appropriate assessment program.
3. Education plans must be designed which meet the individual education needs of handicapped persons as well as their nonhandicapped classmates.
4. Handicapped persons must be involved in the planning process for achieving program accessibility.

5. Separate programs are not to be initiated to serve handicapped people. Handicapped students are to be put into regular programs where and when possible.

The second of these laws, Public Law 94-142, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, further related to program and facility accessibility for handicapped students in vocational education. Areas of P.L. 94-142 which relate directly or indirectly to vocational education and to interagency linkages are as follows:

1. A written individualized education program (IEP) is required for each handicapped student. An interdisciplinary approach which utilizes vocational, special, and academic teachers and counselors is implied.

2. A multi-factored assessment program for determining an appropriate educational plan is required.

3. All handicapped students must be educated in a least restrictive environment.

4. Handicapped students must receive "vocational education" if it consists of specifically designed instruction at no cost to the parents to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child.

A third piece of legislation, P.L. 94-482, Title II of the Education Amendments of 1976, provides further impetus for linkages through the following requirements:

1. Funds from P.L. 94-482 must be used in a manner which is consistent with a state's plan submitted under P.L. 94-142.

2. Handicapped students must be in regular vocational programs to the maximum extent possible.

3. Parents of handicapped students and the students themselves must be informed of the options available to them.

Although these laws do not specifically call for interagency linkages, it is quite easy to surmise that such linkages will greatly facili-

tate the carrying out of the regulations. All three of these public laws relate to each other to the extent that vocational, special, and vocational rehabilitation agencies need to collaborate to carry out their individual obligations.

Parents and advocacy groups have become increasingly verbal in asking for services for their handicapped students. Parents and professionals alike are joining efforts to organize and improve vocational programs for their clients and children.

PRINCIPAL AGENCIES AT THE STATE LEVEL

Agencies to be involved in interagency agreements at the state level will vary from state to state depending on administrative structures and needs. The most common key agencies are vocational education, special education, and vocational rehabilitation, the same three agencies affected by the three major pieces of legislation.

The Michigan Interagency Model and Delivery System of Vocational Education Services for the Handicapped (1975) includes these three agencies as a basis for linkage. In addition, the following agencies and departments and their services are incorporated into the model to be utilized as needed in helping deliver vocational education services to handicapped students:

Adult Continuing Education
Higher Education
Student Financial Aid
Corrections
Labor Aid
Office of Economic Opportunity
Library
Civil Service
Mental Health
Public Health
Social Services
Public School
Compensatory Education
General Education
Public School

In 1979, the California Department of Education and the Department of Rehabilitation signed an agreement to serve as a vehicle for cooperation between the two agencies to provide educational and rehabilitative service to eligible handicapped individuals. The agreement set up guidelines to be followed by state and local agencies in education and rehabilitation in the areas of client find, assessment, program placement, review and implementation, and administrative policies.

An Oklahoma interagency cooperative agreement was signed in 1979 which linked the Division of Rehabilitative and Visual Services, Departments of Special Education, and Vocational and Technical Education. The agreement covered ages 11 through adult and identified areas of responsibility in the following instructional components:

1. Personal adjustments
2. Prevocational Evaluation and Education
3. Vocational Training
4. Job Placement and Follow-up
5. Adult Training

Services for Handicapped students in the areas of referral, assessment, program planning, and related services were also identified for delivery by specific agencies. An agreement was signed in Idaho (1978) between the State Department of Education, the State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the State Division of Vocational Education. The agreement contained a Statement of Philosophy and Purpose, Target Populations, Individual Education Plans and Programs, Related Services and Vocational Education Support, Procedural Safeguards, Inservice Training, and Management Information. A list of possible services and the agency under which the services would be divided was provided.

Many other states have developed similar interagency agreements which center around vocational education, special education, and vocational rehabilitation. It should not be assumed that other agencies are to be excluded. A USOE project, at the Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center (1979), "Vocational Education Models for Linking Agencies Serving the Handicapped," is working with vocational and special education, rehabilitation, and guidance to develop linkage models. In this project, over 40 states have met in individual teams to assess linkage developments and to provide information on linkage status. The project activities center around helping three states to implement their linkage model.

Other agencies may also be involved at the state level. Advocacy groups, and employment and labor organizations are commonly involved in demanding and helping with the development of services.

LOCAL LEVEL AGENCIES

District 916 Area Vocational-Technical Institute at White Bear Lake, Minnesota has an interagency project called SERVE. SERVE is an acronym for the state agencies involved which are Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Vocational Education. The goal of the project is to support and implement vocational education for handicapped students.

Project SERVE began in 1969 when four special education directors recognized the lack of adequate resources in individual districts and focused on a plan to provide programs on a cooperative interdistrict basis. Their discussions led to the establishment of the East Metropolitan Special Education Council (EMSEC). Ultimately with the help of

local school districts, state and federal monies, EMSEC's Executive Director, special educators, and school administrators began developing guidelines for a model work experience program and mapped out a strategy for state level coordination of resources.

District 916 now offers integrated vocational training for special needs students in 57 regular vocational technical offerings. In addition to serving handicapped students, SERVE is also a model administrative program for the coordination of fiscal resources for handicapped students on the local and state levels.

A project to fund four pilot demonstrations of cooperation among the following agencies has been funded by the Wisconsin Association for Developmental Disabilities and the Association for Retarded Citizens in Wisconsin:

1. Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
2. Community/Unified Board/Developmental Disabilities Board
3. Rehabilitation/Developmental Center
4. Job Service
5. Comprehensive Employment and Training Act
6. Vocational-Technical and Adult Education Schools
7. Public Schools' Vocational Education Program

The objective is to develop a plan and implement innovative model demonstration projects which involve the coordination of a minimum of four of these seven agencies. The above examples provide an idea of how local and state interagency collaboration can be achieved. The federal interagency agreements act as a cornerstone for the development of similar agreements at the state and local level. Many states currently have written linkage agreements or have agreements in process. Local level agencies and handicapped people are the ultimate recipients of the federal and state linkages.

REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTER EFFORT

The Regional Resource Center Task Force on Interagency Collaboration (1979) recently developed a series of five manuals on "Interagency Collaboration on Full Services for Handicapped Children and Youth." The volumes deal with state level planning, local implementation, federal policies and agreements on health education and social service programs, federal policies on vocationally-oriented education and rehabilitation programs, and an annotated bibliography and glossary of acronyms and terms.

Interagency collaboration at the local level is probably the most critical area of linkage at this time. Linkage at the local levels determines whether or not handicapped people will receive full services. The task force manual on a "Guide to Local Implementation" is especially important at this time. A list of the strategies provided in the manual are listed below:

1. Determine needs and rationale for initiation of the interprogram collaboration project.
2. Define service delivery populations of interest.
3. Identify agencies and programs serving or authorized to serve the target population(s) and contact agency administrator.
4. Define current program policies and service responsibilities or identified programs.
5. Compare local programs and procedures to identify gaps, overlaps, constraints, and needed linkages.
6. Identify local policies and procedures wherein modifications would enable satisfaction of need and rationale for collaboration and specify the needed modifications.

7. Determine which modifications can be made on the local level and incorporate these modifications in a local interprogram agreement.

8. Enable implementation of the interprogram agreement.

9. Implement local evaluation functions.

LEAD AGENCY

The question of lead agency will arise when formulating interagency agreements. This lead could be assigned or assumed by any one of a number of agencies. Due to the requirements of Public Law 94-142, a special education agency may be the lead agency in a state. In other cases the vocational education agency may take the lead in developing services for the education of handicapped students. In some cases rehabilitaton agencies are taking the lead. Additional agencies may also assume the leadership role. Much depends on the state political situation, where the most aggressive leaders are working and who have the initiative, or the greatest need. Usually the leadership role will be assumed by those with the clients and/or the funds.

Which agency assumes the lead role is not as important as the development of good interagency cooperation among those with the capacity to contribute to or benefit from the agreement. It is important that a specific agency act as lead in order to provide coordination of services and to keep the problems of handicapped people at the forefront of the activities.

CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE WORKING AGREEMENTS

Paramount to effective working agreements is the consent to work together. Any two or more agencies can begin and then expand the

agreement to other agencies as the linkage process progresses. Early in the linkage process the agencies will have to deal with the allocation of funds and the standards and guidelines to which they will adhere.

Interagency linkage teams which are effectively working together possess many of the following characteristics:

1. Participants work together to identify problems which are common to the group. They consider the handicapped student, labor, equipment, knowledge of services to be provided and monies available.

2. They explore all possible solutions and choose those solutions which will be most beneficial to handicapped students.

3. There is a constant desire to keep the commitments alive and to expand the interagency linkages when and where necessary to benefit the handicapped student.

4. Ideas are shared between local and state levels.

5. The interagency team encourages and supports local level service providers and handicapped persons.

6. A good community spirit or atmosphere exists towards the education and employment of handicapped people.

7. There is a desire to decrease the overlap in services, and the fear of losing prestige or jobs by eliminating overlapping services is not dominant.

8. The objectives of the cooperating agencies are compatible and agency personnel feel that cooperation will be of mutual benefit.

9. Agencies have a referral system which sends clients to the agency with the best resources to help the individual.

Hage and Aiken (1968) studied the joint programs among 16 health and welfare agencies in one community to identify the characteristics of

agencies which had the most interagency agreements. The following were found to be the characteristics of the leading agencies:

1. The agency staff had more specialized functions and more different types of activities within the organization.
2. The agency was more innovative in that they had more programs.
3. Agency staff communicated with each other, had more committees and more frequent meetings.
4. Agency staff had more input into decision-making.
5. A general interest in innovation existed.
6. The agency had a history of cooperation.
7. The agency had a mutual desire to decrease overlap in services and to make maximum use of resources.
8. The agency objectives were compatible with other agencies.

Probably the most logical reason for creating effective working agreements is self-interest. A true self-interest has to benefit both parties in the agreement. Benefits of self-interest may be a gain in status from cooperation with a more prestigious agency, a gain in client or business contacts, use of new equipment or spaces, a chance to trade resources, or a chance to become better known in the community.

PROCEDURAL CONSIDERATIONS IN CREATING COOPERATIVE LINKAGE AGREEMENTS

A process continuum of twelve steps involved in interagency linkage was developed by the Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center staff (1979). The twelve steps are as follows and involve commitment and leadership at each step:

1. Decision to establish linkage
2. Choose a lead agency
3. Establish interagency team
4. Review linkage agreements
5. Comparative program analysis
6. Develop mutual goals
7. Assessing the risks
8. Formulate linkage design
9. Negotiate written agreements
10. Implement agreements
11. Evaluation
12. Monitoring

A National Workshop for the Development of Comprehensive Secondary Programming of Rehabilitation Services for the Handicapped (1979) developed a suggested framework for effecting interagency cooperation for handicapped students. The resulting publication, Cooperative Planning for the Handicapped, listed five major objectives in facilitating interagency coordination which include:

1. To organize an interagency team which will become responsible for developing and implementing an interagency cooperative services agreement.
2. To develop mutual goals which describe the outcomes desired from an interagency services agreement.
3. To prepare a written agreement.
4. To insure implementation of the agreement.
5. To evaluate the effectiveness of the written agreement and its implementation.

An interagency task force meeting on interagency cooperation was held in North Dakota (1979). The following content was suggested when making procedural agreements at the state level:

1. Provide for coordinated planning, reporting, and funding cycles.
2. Provide state administrative procedures.
3. Provide definitions.
4. Provide forms and formats.
5. Develop referral mechanisms.

6. Provide for state and local communication, information dissemination, and training.

7. Provide an integrated data base.

The content of procedural agreements at the local level were:

1. Specify the role that the various types of personnel play in outreach and screening.

2. Identify the referral procedures to be used, who is responsible, and which students will be referred to whom.

3. Specify the role which various types of personnel will play in assessment, IEP devlopment, placement, implementation, and review.

4. Identify those serving as case managers and the procedures to be followed in specific situations.

5. Specify how annual planning, budgeting, and reporting will be coordinated.

Although this may not be a complete list of procedures to be set up, it does give an idea of those procedures which must be considered in the development of successful linkage agreements. Careful preplanning of procedures is the forerunner of interagency implementation of formal agreements.

POLICIES WHICH NEED TO BE ADOPTED BY STATE AGENCIES REGARDING THE DEVELOPMENT, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION OF COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

State education agencies can develop specific policies which will enhance the success of interagency agreements and smooth out the delivery of educational services to handicapped people. Federal and state regulations stemming from the host of new legislation recently passed

may be confusing to many and even act as a barrier to the improvement of education to handicapped students. State agencies can help clarify these regulations through public education programs and position papers directed toward their population. Policies on funding and the utilization of matching funds at the local level would be helpful.

Requirements that local interagency linkages be established and local funds be committed would assure input at the community level. In order to help local level students, state education agencies should develop funding patterns which are not disruptive to program planning or to the staffing of good educational programs.

There should be an agreement at the state level as to which is the lead agency and a specific leader if possible, especially one who can be contacted in case of controversies. All parties to the linkage agreement should voice support for the agreement. Policies relating to the job descriptions of liaison persons in each agency need to be established. It would be more than appropriate to assign creative personnel to implement linkage agreements. If possible the assignment of office space of people involved in linkages should be in the same general area. This may help establish frequent communications and facilitate the development of interagency inservice programs for local personnel.

State education agencies need to provide adequate training for state staff in the area of interagency linkages. As linkages are written, the assigned responsibilities of each agency should be clearly established. Persons to be involved in implementing the agreements need to be informed of their obligations as early as possible. In the

implementation of the agreements, the focus needs to be on the specific needs of handicapped students at the local level. The question of whether or not the handicapped student is achieving career goals and learning an employable skill should be paramount at all times.

An effective cooperative monitoring system of interagency activities needs to be established. A system which evaluates services to the handicapped student at the local level would be most useful. The following questions need to be answered:

1. How successful are vocational services at the local level?
2. Are the handicapped students achieving career objectives?
3. Are handicapped students being employed?
4. If adequate services are not available or being implemented, where is the breakdown occurring?
5. How can services be improved?

On the positive side, feedback from meetings, workshops, and reports of increased access to vocational programs would be an indication of linkage success. Other indicators of success would be a decrease in dropouts among handicapped students, higher enrollment, and news of coordinated local efforts and interagency liaisons.

Carefully planned and updated state policies on interagency linkages can effectively stimulate the development of good vocational education programs for handicapped students. The development of such policies should be a top priority item.

STAFFING INTERAGENCY LINKAGES

Probably the most important strategy in staffing is to appoint interagency team members who have the authority to make decisions or at least the ability to influence decision makers. Conversely, agencies who are participating for political purposes only find it convenient to select persons without decision making abilities or authority for interagency teams. Another strategy to help assure successful interagency linkages would be to choose team members who are responsible for the accountability of services to handicapped students.

It is not likely that the sole duties of an interagency team member would be directed at interagency cooperation. Such an assignment would probably be only one of many different duties. Therefore, it is important that the interagency team member have authority to make decisions, be resourceful, creative, and alert to problems which may interfere with the implementation of the linkage agreements.

Another strategy would be for the decision makers to appoint staff from the middle management area to implement the agreements and be responsible to those making the decisions. Establishing and maintaining communications among those responsible for carrying out agreements and those not directly involved is of great importance. Cooperation is not only an interagency team effort. It is also a team effort for all members of each cooperating agency. Anything less than full cooperation among agency employees will deteriorate the linkage agreement.

CONCLUSION

Pressure to develop vocational education and other programs for handicapped students has been applied to educators in an increasing manner during the past few years. This pressure has come from parents, educators, employers, advocacy groups, handicapped people, and legislation. Recent public laws dealing with vocational and special education and rehabilitation have essentially collaborated in forcing these three agencies to work together, and to involve other agencies in the process. The political mood calls for a conservation of resources and a tightening of budgets. It is apparent in the education and employment of handicapped students that no one agency has all the answers or resources to provide total services. Therefore, interagency and community cooperation are vital to the career development of handicapped people.

Any number of agencies can take the lead in developing cooperative interagency agreements. There are numerous states which have cooperative agreements and many attempts at interagency cooperation are now being made. Characteristics of successful linkages are beginning to emerge. To successfully link with another agency, the employees must be able to communicate, explore problem areas, and jointly seek solutions. Providing increased and improved services to handicapped people must be the first objective of interagency linkage.

State and local level interagency linkage attempts must be supported by carefully planned policy and procedural guidelines. Agency personnel who have the ability to make decisions should be appointed to

the interagency teams. Funding sources must maintain a consistency which will not disrupt continuing programs and staffing patterns.

Inservice training programs are needed to assist state level staff and local agencies in acquiring the techniques of implementing inter-agency agreements. There should be a system to evaluate the effect of interagency agreements on the number of handicapped students enrolled in vocational programs and students obtaining employable skills and employment. Only after the services improve, and the employment of handicapped people increases, can we say that interagency agreements are truly successful.

REFERENCES

California Department of Education and Department of Rehabilitation. Interagency Agreement. Sacramento, California, 1979.

Hage, Jerald, and Aiken, Michael. Coordinating Human Services. In RUL Number Six: Guidelines for Interagency Cooperation and the Severely Disabled. Research Utilization Laboratory, Jewish Vocational Service, Chicago, Illinois, 1977.

Idaho State Department of Education. Special Education and Related Services for Idaho's Handicapped/Exceptional Students. Boise, Idaho, 1978.

Levine, Sol and White, Paul E. Why Agencies Do Cooperate. In RUL Number Six: Guidelines for Interagency Cooperation and the Severely Disabled. Research Utilization Laboratory, Jewish Vocational Service, Chicago, Illinois, 1977.

Michigan Departments of Vocational-Technical Education, Special Education, and Vocational Rehabilitation. Michigan Interagency Model and Delivery System of Vocational Services for the Handicapped. Lansing, Michigan, 1975.

Midwest Regional Resource Center. Interagency Cooperation, A State Level Task Force Meeting. Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, 1979.

National Workshop for the Development of Comprehensive Secondary Programming and Rehabilitation Services for the Handicapped. Cooperative Planning for the Handicapped. Washington, D.C., 1979.

Oklahoma Departments of Education, Vocational and Technical Education, and Rehabilitation. Oklahoma Interagency Cooperative Agreement. Oklahoma, 1979.

Regional Resource Center Task Force on Interagency Collaboration. Interagency Collaboration on Full Services for Handicapped Children and Youth. Five Volumes. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Washington, D.C., 1979.

Tindall, Lloyd W., Gugerty, John J., Crowley, Carol B., Betzel, Elizabeth Evans, and Ostby, Carol Cohen. Vocational Education Models for Linking Agencies Serving the Handicapped. Madison: Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1979.

EPILOGUE

Recent federal legislation and initiatives have strongly suggested the need for interagency cooperation and agreements. Federal agencies have initiated activities to promote the development of agreements. In addition, the authors have confirmed the necessity of effective interagency cooperation and agreements among the public and private agencies which provide handicapped learners with vocational instruction and related services. Several issues were identified that inhibit cooperation and various recommendations were suggested.

In terms of State Planning for Interagency Cooperation and Agreements, the following major issues should be further addressed:

- Comprehensive review of the legislative documents needs to be made to enable a continuum of cooperative planning, program implementation, and funding be made available in the most cost-effective way.
- Funding resources need to be coordinated.
- Coordination of the cross-over of populations needs to occur.
- Need to determine if there are inhibitors to cooperation with the process contained in the regulations and policies.
- Need to eliminate "turf problems."

Training Educational Personnel is critical for Implementing Effective Interagency Cooperation and Agreements. Several issues and recommendations were suggested:

- Service agencies which provide services to the handicapped can be guided more effectively through a change process by utilizing the concepts of interorganizational behavior.

- Effective short-range and long-range interagency cooperation can be accomplished if all personnel are active participants in identifying, internalizing, and formulating new agency behaviors.

- The barriers to interagency cooperation and agreements need to be identified and removed, and the facilitators need to be identified and used in developing agreements.

- Personnel preparation should include: an orientation to vocational education, familiarity with local industry, awareness of specific job-entry level requirements by industry, and knowledge about job placement.

- Need to provide funding resources for training.

Several specific issues and concerns were identified and addressed with respect to preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel for Working With Students Who Have Special Needs. Some of the major issues and recommendations include:

- The relative success and effectiveness of special needs coursework at the undergraduate level has not been thoroughly researched or documented.

- Competency studies have provided an adequate amount of lists; however, there is a need to categorize, stratify, and define the skills and knowledges that are required by teachers, counselors, coordinators, and administrators who provide vocational services to Special Needs Learners.

- Appropriate staff development formats should be identified for inservice personnel preparation programs.

- Information on resources and materials should be provided for the vocational teacher that he or she can use in the classroom.

- Personnel preparation trainers need to coordinate the various disciplinary backgrounds of the trainees.

- It is important to delegate responsibility to a person or persons for staff development or personnel preparation when using the Resource Vocational Teacher concept.

- Successful interdisciplinary training can develop and thrive only in situations where the interagency cooperation efforts materialize in the forms of formal agreements and memorandum.

- Administrative leadership and responsiveness are essential if genuine interdisciplinary training is to be achieved.

With respect to Effective Linkages for Interagency Cooperation, the following issues and recommendations are suggested:

- Personnel must be able to communicate, explore problem areas, and jointly seek solutions.

- State and local level interagency linkage efforts must be supported by carefully planned policy and procedural guidelines.

- Leaders and decision makers should be identified and appointed to interagency teams.

- Funding resources must maintain a consistency which will not disrupt continuing programs and staffing patterns.

- Inservice training programs are needed to assist state level staff and local agencies in acquiring the techniques of implementing interagency agreements.

- There should be a system to evaluate the efforts of interagency agreements on the number of handicapped students enrolled in vocational programs and students obtaining skills and employment.

The identified issues and functional recommendations will hopefully provide information that will assist in overcoming the barriers to interagency cooperation and agreements. The issues cannot be considered an exhaustive list. However, the issues and recommendations provide considerations for planning, implementing, and evaluating interagency cooperation and agreements.